

Amendments

In the specification

The previous abstract has been deleted and a new abstract has been added, including the chemical structure of spongiosine (2-methoxyadenosine). Support may be found, for example, in the previous abstract and throughout the specification.

The paragraph beginning at page 2, line 7, which starts with "There is, therefore. . ." has been deleted and has been reinserted after the paragraph ending at page 3, line 1.

Section headings have been added throughout the specification for "TECHNICAL FIELD," "BACKGROUND," "SUMMARY AND DETAILED DESCRIPTION," and "DESCRIPTION OF DRAWINGS."

It has come to Applicant's attention that the descriptions of Figures 4 and 5 and Examples 4 and 5 in the specification erroneously recite the neuropathic pain model as the chronic constriction injury neuropathic pain model. The descriptions of Figures 4 and 5 at page 7, lines 18-21 have been amended to replace the phrase "the chronic constriction injury neuropathic pain model" with the phrase "a neuropathic pain model." Similarly, the descriptions of Examples 4 and 5 have been amended to replace the phrase "caused by chronic constriction injury of the rat sciatic nerve" with the phrase "in a model of neuropathic pain" according to the descriptions of Figures 4 and 5. Further, the description of chronic constriction injury in Example 4, i.e., "Under anaesthesia . . . right and left paws." is deleted.

In the claims

Amendments have been made throughout the claims to correct typographical errors, to maintain antecedent basis, to remove repetitive language, to clarify language, and to clarify Markush groups.

Amendment of claim 15 to delete the exemplary term "pelvicpain/PID" is made to clarify language because this term is encompassed by the generic term "pelvic pain" elsewhere in claim 15. This amendment does not alter the scope of the corresponding generic term "pelvic pain", which continues to encompass both the deleted exemplary term, e.g., pelvic pain associated with

pelvic inflammatory disease, and pelvic pain generally. Also, amendments have been made to remove duplication of certain terms in claims 15 and 18.

The preceding amendments are not intended to limit the claims in any way.

Claim 11 is amended to direct the claim to a method of treatment. The method of prevention is moved to new independent claim 32, and new dependent claims 33-46 correspond to certain dependent claims of claim 11.

No new matter is added by these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the preceding amendments.

Remarks

Objection regarding the Abstract under M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b)

The Examiner objects to the abstract as allegedly not meeting requirements. The Examiner suggests exemplary language found in the M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b), e.g., "The compounds are of the class of alkyl benzene sulfonyl ureas, useful as oral anti-diabetics." Further, the Examiner alleges that the abstract is "excessively brief, and specifically fails to include the structure of the active ingredient."

Applicant has added a new abstract which follows the language of the Examiner's suggestion and which includes the chemical structure of spongiosine (2-methoxyadenosine). Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the corresponding objection.

Applicant believes the abstract as originally filed fully meets the requirements found in the M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b), and notes that there are no requirements that an abstract have a minimum length or that an abstract display a chemical structure. Applicant has made the above amendments solely to comply with the Examiner's objection, and does not intend these amendments to limit the present application or the claims in any way.

Written Description Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph

Claims 11-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application